



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,295	04/27/2004	David Armes	03292.101980	3294
66569 7590 06/19/2007 FITZPATRICK CELLA (AMEX) 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112			EXAMINER LY, CHEYNE D	
			ART UNIT 2168	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/19/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/709,295	Applicant(s) ARMES ET AL.	
	Examiner Cheyne D. Ly	Art Unit 2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicants' arguments filed March 28, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.
2. The amendment to the specification has been entered.
3. Claims 1-26 are examined on the merits.

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

4. On pages 10-11, Applicant argues Chu fails to disclose the limitation of "a file transformation component configured to at least one of reformat, validate, and enrich file content using enterprise logic." Applicant points to paragraphs [0023] to [0025] of the instant specification to support that Chu fails to disclose the argued limitation in light of the specification. Applicant's argument is not persuasive because disclosure of "Enterprise logic may include..." is merely an exemplary disclosure; therefore, does not limit the claimed limitation to said disclosure.
5. Second, the claims are given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification. However, the instant claims are not limited to the exemplary disclosure have been cited from the specification by Applicant as limitations that are not disclosed by the cited prior art. As cited by the MPEP, the court explained that "reading a claim in light of the specification, to thereby interpret limitations explicitly recited in the claim, is a quite different thing from reading limitations of the specification into a claim," to

thereby narrow the scope of the claim by implicitly adding disclosed limitations which have no express basis in the claim.” The court found that applicant was advocating the latter, i.e., the impermissible importation of subject matter from the specification into the claim.). See also *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (MPEP §2111 [R-1]).

6. Third, the argued limitation is directed to one of the three optionally claimed limitations (at least one of reformat, validate, and enrich file content using enterprise logic”).

Therefore, as long as the prior describes one of the three limitations, the prima facie case of anticipation has been established. For example, Chu discloses a validation step (page 8, [0106]-[0107], especially, “If valid data is read...”). The limitation of “business rules...” has been interpreted reasonably broad because the instant specification does not explicitly define said limitation. The invention described by Chu is directed to end-to-end secure file transfer method and system as directed to “reports, articles, advertisements,...spreadsheets (page 1, [0005]). The cited method and system have been interpreted as being directed to business application; therefore, would achieve the same expected result as the claimed method in regard to the limitation of “business rules.”

7. On pages 11-12, Applicant argues that Chu fails to describe the limitation of “A messaging infrastructure component configured to facilitate workflow management of said files through said system.” Applicant’s argument is not persuasive because the cited portion of Chu reasonably described the argument. For example, Applicant provides an exemplary disclosure of “the file workflow configuration that may include how the files are routed through the File Services System” (paragraph [0027] of the publication of the

Art Unit: 2168

instant application). Therefore, the cited disclosure of instructions for transferring and uploading files (page 1, [0011]) reasonably anticipates the argued limitation as exemplified by the instant specification.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chu et al. (2002/0049853 A1) (Chu hereafter).

CLAIM INTERPRETATIONS

10. The limitation of “agent” has been attributed with the customary and ordinary meaning of “a process that mediates between the client and the server” in client/server applications (Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary, 3rd edition, page 16).

PRIOR ART

11. In regard to claim 1, Chu discloses a system to facilitate movement of electronic files comprising:

A file transfer services component configured to at least one of transmit and receive a file request, said file transfer services component configured to communicate with a centralized file management hub (page 1, [0009], especially, “transferring a file...from the DAD server...”);

Art Unit: 2168

A file transformation component configured to at least one of reformat, validate and enrich file content using enterprise logic (page 3, [0054], especially, “file compression, archiving,...encryption...” and page 8, [0108]);

A centralized file management hub configured to communicate with a messaging infrastructure (page 1, [0014], especially, “a digital asset distribution (DAD) server...”); and,

A messaging infrastructure component configured to facilitate workflow management of said files through said system (page 1, [0011], especially, “issuing first instructions...”).

12. In regard to claim 2, Chu discloses said centralized file management hub includes:

A file tracking and monitoring component configured to provide end-to-end tracking of a file (page 1, [0013], especially, “a tracking component...”, and page 3, [0052], especially, “monitor...”) and role based multilayered tracking information of a file (page 6, [0083], especially, “multiple user levels...administrator and sub-users”);

A parameter and configuration management component configured to provide a gateway to at least one of store and retrieve configuration information (page 4, [0061], especially, “...server site URL provides the universal uniqueness to the PID...assist the server-to-server transfer...download records may be added into the database”; and,

A file routing and workflow component configured to route a file through a network and provide routing information to file transfer nodes to facilitate at least one of routing and scheduling of a file transfer (page 4, [0062]-[0063], especially, “address book...Sender File Names (24) and Location (25)...”).

13. In regard to claim 3, Chu discloses the centralized file management hub further includes a parameter and configuration management component, wherein said parameter and configuration management component includes...file transfer routing information...(page 4, [0062]-[0063], especially, “address book...Sender File Names (24) and Location (25)...”).
14. In regard to claim 4, Chu discloses display tracking information (page 4, [0064], especially, “interface...Tracking (TRACE)”).
15. In regard to claim 5, Chu discloses a manager interface configured to at least one of receive configuration information and display tracking information (page 4, [0064], especially, “interface...Tracking (TRACE)”), wherein said configuration information includes at least one of client authentication....(page 3, [0051], especially, “sender input a unique username and password...”)...and wherein said tracking information includes a workflow task outcome (page 4, [0064] to page 6, [0084]), Figure 3 in its entirety exemplifies a workflow task outcome).
16. In regard to claim 6, Chu discloses the file transfer services component includes:

One file transfer agent (Figure 5 wherein the server components have been interpreted as “agents” as defined by the Microsoft dictionary);

A file transfer application server...(Figure 5, especially, “Server” and “Remote Server”);

User interface...(page 4, [0064]).
17. In regard to claims 7 and 8, Chu discloses a user interface...(page 4, [0064]-[0065], especially, “Client Browser screen components...send client software embedded in HTML...”).

18. In regard to claims 9 and 10, Chu discloses a file transformation component is further configured to apply a transformation map to said file (page 7, [0097], especially, “sender has the option to cancel a lengthy upload and resume upload at a later time...the program will resume uploading portion of the file and so indicate in the restart offset...” and page 8, [0114], especially, “support partial file transfer...receive command requesting...”). The disclosure cited above is consistent the exemplary description of “a transformation map” in the instant specification (paragraph [0025]).
19. In regard to claim 11, Chu discloses one file transfer agent is further configured to notify said central file management hub of workflow events (page 7, [0103], especially, “delivery of the download notification to the primary DAD server”).
20. In regard to claims 12-26, Chu discloses a method (claim 1) implemented in the above-cited system. Further, Chu discloses a validation step (page 8, [0106]-[0107], especially, “If valid data is read...”). Specific to claims 22 and 23, the limitation of “business rules...” has been interpreted reasonably broad because the instant specification does not explicitly define said limitation. The invention described by Chu is directed to end-to-end secure file transfer method and system as directed to “reports, articles, advertisements,...spreadsheets (page 1, [0005]). The cited method and system have been interpreted as being directed to business application; therefore, would achieve the same expected result as the claimed method in regard to the limitation of “business rules.”

CONCLUSION

21. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

22. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.
23. Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables

Art Unit: 2168

applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

24. For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199. The USPTO's official fax number is 571-272-8300.

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. Dune Ly, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0716.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8 A.M. to 4 P.M.

26. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo, can be reached on (571) 272-3642.

C. Dune Ly
Patent Examiner

6/3/07

